



LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**Louisiana Department of Education**  
**Race to the Top Monitoring Plan, Protocols, and Schedule**

Louisiana Believes.

## I. Background

Louisiana's Race to the Top-Phase 3 (RTTT) opportunity is a \$17.4 million grant supporting several very challenging, high-result changes for the children and educators of our State. Louisiana is committed to ensuring maximum transparency and accountability in using its RTTT funding to bring about the priorities of the State's *Louisiana Believes Plan*, ensuring success for students in college, careers, and life. These resources will support increased student achievement, increased high school graduation rates, narrowing the achievement gap, and preparing students for success in college and the workforce. The funds support the goals and activities of both the SEA and the LEA to dramatically improve student achievement through six ambitious education projects:

- The **Trailblazer Initiative** began with 32 LEAs committed to implementing deep-level reforms and to working with the State and the District Support Office. The Trailblazer Initiative initially focused on increasing awareness, adoption and implementation of key reforms in the areas of Human Capital, School Turnaround, Instructional Improvement, and Organizational Excellence. Emphasis was given to improving STEM education. In the spring of 2012, this initiative expanded to include all 70 LEAs in our state. Using District Support Office Network Teams, the LDOE will help the LEAs implement the new Compass evaluation system and support their transition to the state-adopted Common Core State Standards (CCSS).
- **Implementing Enhanced STEM Standards: Common Core State Standards (CCSS)** includes professional development for educators to ensure students' access to rigorous STEM course offerings. The Louisiana RTTT plan includes the development, implementation, and delivery of professional development modules aligned with the Common Core State Standards in ELA, Math and Next Generation Science Standards. The modules are designed to support effective instructional practices based on the new curricula. Two projects under this umbrella include implementing ACT and AP initiatives to further support LEAs. The ACT and AP initiatives will enhance face-to-face instruction while supporting the application of 21<sup>st</sup> century skills.
- **EAGLE: Using Data to Improve Instruction.** The LDOE-created Enhanced Assessment of Grade-Level Expectations (EAGLE) assessment tool will be expanded to include additional benchmark assessment capabilities aligned to the Common Core State Standards. This expansion will give educators access to enhanced reporting features to inform planning for instruction and assessment.
- The implementation of the **Compass Evaluation Tool** is being supported through the electronic Human Capital Information System (HCIS), thus improving data collection and interpretation. Louisiana's path to STEM educator effectiveness will include an evaluation rubric aligned to the CCSS and measures of student growth in tested and non-tested grades and subjects through the use of Student Learning Targets (SLTs). Compass will support LEAs and school leaders by providing individualized teachers' and leaders' effectiveness data to more efficiently identify educators in need of assistance. It will also align support and professional development, particularly in STEM-related subjects.
- **Louisiana's Statewide Staffing Initiative** utilizes staffing supports that ensure district staff and school leaders are able to effectively access and utilize the educator pipeline to staff the lowest-performing schools with highly effective educators, particularly in STEM subjects. The activities in Louisiana's *Believe Plan* will significantly increase the supply of talent and improve

equity in the distribution of effective teachers and leaders throughout the state, particularly in the highest-need schools and across shortage areas such as STEM. It will also dramatically increase the number of educators who are available to serve. Recently passed legislation, such as Act 1 from the 2012 Louisiana Legislative Session, has led to the expansion of this work to address broader district policies and protocols (i.e., reduction in force, performance management, performance-based contracts, salary schedules that weigh effectiveness, etc.) that address human capital management in a holistic manner.

- The **High Performance LEAs Initiative** provides for the scaling and incubating of high-performing charter schools and supports innovative reforms that advance student achievement.

Louisiana has partnered with 47 LEAs and charter schools across the State to identify and initiate Scopes of Work (SOW) aligned with Louisiana's Sub-Criterion Performance Measures (**Appendix A**) identified and captured in the priority elements of the *Louisiana Believes Plan* and the SEA Race to the Top-Phase 3 application. All of the key activities outlined are strategic levers for increasing instructional effectiveness.

### **Key Purposes of the Performance Plan**

The performance plan serves four key purposes:

1. Tracking Louisiana's progress in implementing all six SEA projects and sub-projects supporting the RTTT program initiatives and making informed decisions on redirections based on performance monitoring;
2. Assessing the progress that LEA sub-recipients are making toward meeting goals and activities, and identifying gaps in reaching those goals;
3. Identifying effective practices and enabling collaborative learning for outcomes among LEAs that will improve implementation of the RTTT initiatives and support the *Louisiana Believes Plan*; and
4. Ensuring sub-recipient LEA RTTT funds have the internal controls needed to prevent waste, abuse, and fraud, and that funds are spent on appropriate activities, aligned with approved budgets.

## **II. Louisiana RTTT Monitoring Plans**

The Executive Director of Grants Management in the District Support Office of LDOE will serve as Project Director for the RTTT grant. The SOW and budgets for the SEA will be monitored by the Project Director, with the help of staff from the Office of Grants Management and oversight from the LDOE Division of Management and Finance. The Division of Management and Finance will provide monthly expenditure reports for each SEA RTTT project budget. As implementation progresses, LDOE will produce SEA and LEA reports that highlight at a glance which projects and outcomes are on track and which are not yet attained.

To ensure fidelity of implementation from the LEAs, LDOE has configured and implemented an online monitoring system, **Indistar®**, to manage performance and progress monitoring. RTTT

Indicators (**Appendix B**) and each LEA's Scope of Work (SOW) will be monitored online with follow-up LEA onsite visits made to address compliance issues. There are 19 indicators each district will be asked to self-report on, via the Indistar® following each quarter. (See Pages 7-8, Section IV.) The 19 indicators are included in Appendix B of this Monitoring Plan and fall under six categories:

- **(A)(2) Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale Up and Sustain Proposed Plans**
- **(B)(3) Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessment**
- **(C)(3) Using Data to Improve Instruction**
- **(D)(2) Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance**
- **(D)(3) Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Leaders**
- **(E)(2) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

Indistar® provides parallel tracks for districts requiring rapid improvement (turnaround) and those on a continuous improvement trajectory. Communication is the key and Indistar® promotes efficiency and timeliness of monitoring resulting in streamlined efforts and on-going assessment of what's working and where adjustments are needed.

Quarterly check-ins/reports from LEAs will be uploaded using the Indistar® monitoring system for program evaluation and the eGMS will provide information regarding LEA budgets. LDOE staff assigned as the State's LEA Coaches will review quarterly reports and provide regular feedback to LEA and District Support Network Staff on their Scope of Work implementation and budget expenditures, no more than 30 days after the report due dates, via the "Coach's Feedback" sections of Indistar®. Oversight and compliance will be the responsibility of the Executive Director of Grants Management and the Grants Management Coaches and staff. If compliance issues are discovered after desktop or onsite monitoring, the sub-recipient LEA will be asked to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) using Indistar®, and the CAP will be reviewed by the State's Coaches and Executive Director, with approval made through Indistar®.

Each month, budgets and expenditures for the LEAs' RTTT SOW will be monitored for compliance using LDOE's electronic grants management system (eGMS). Louisiana will leverage staff in the Office of Grants Management to drive the management of these projects throughout the LDOE and LEAs, and to inform the reporting process to USED. Comprehensive training on the use of performance measures for planning and implementation as well as training on Indistar® and eGMS has been developed and will be delivered to participating districts in September 2012.

This tiered monitoring approach for budgets and the SOW ensures something as simple as a single reimbursement request or as detailed as a request for a series of LEA reports or audits is not allowed to fall through the cracks. The State's process for verifying that LEAs have implemented corrective actions will include Indistar® (for programmatic monitoring) and eGMS (for budget monitoring), along with site-visits and the Corrective Action Plans, when necessary. Grants Management staff can refer identified support needs for an LEA to the District Support Network Team that services that LEA.

- **Monitoring of Expenditures for LEA (Sub-Recipients).** Each LEA submitted a Scope of Work (SOW) in their application that describes how the LEA will use their RTTT funding. The SOW helps LEAs and LDOE to organize and align the implementation of the full RTTT grant and allows LDOE to hold each LEA accountable for use of the funds. The LEA SOW is used to establish and approve all sub-recipient budgets. The LEA RTTT indicators will be monitored using Indistar®, and budgets will be managed using eGMS. Any change in the SOW or budget will require the submission and approval of a revised SOW and a budget amendment. The LDOE, sub-recipient LEAs, and other state agencies must comply with the Federal Single Audit Act and testing of expenditures in accordance with the Federal Compliance Supplement.
- **Monitoring of Expenditures for SEA (Direct Recipient).** The LDOE RTTT Grants Management Office is subject to internal control audits as well oversight by the LDOE Finance and Budgets Division. Any changes to the approved RTTT budget or projects require approval from the Superintendent or his designee, as outlined by the guidelines, unless they necessitate an amendment request. The SEA's sub-criterion Performance Measures will be measured and reported each year to ensure continuous improvement, to document that the outcomes and quality of the program are in compliance, and to support coherent and thoughtful reform in the State.
- **Project Management.** The Project Director and Grants Management Office in the SEA will oversee both programmatic and budget monitoring as described in Louisiana's SOW to ensure that related activities remain aligned to the assurance areas listed. Data will be collected through the online Indistar® system for Performance Management of LEA RTTT funded activities.

The LDOE District Support Network Teams will provide real-time support to LEAs to facilitate implementation of the six projects and the LEAs' goals and activities. The RTTT Project Manager and Grants Management staff will have regular communication with the District Support Network Leaders to discuss the six projects, the implementation of each LEA's SOW, completion of goals, activities, and expenditure of funds. Each LEA RTTT superintendent will receive support from their District Support Network Team based on pertinent data and needs in meeting the goals as outlined in their Scope of Work. The District Support Office Grants Management staff will monitor the LEA's 3-year budgets, submitted through the State's electronic grants management system, eGMS. If non-compliance issues occur, amendments to the implementation timelines and SOW will be negotiated.

In the event a non-compliance issue occurs, the LDOE will follow the following protocols:

- The LDOE and LEA will have informal discussions in an effort to gain understanding and resolve the issue. As circumstances warrant, LDOE will offer technical assistance and support to help the LEA resolve any concerns about non-compliance.

- The LDOE will formally notify the LEA in writing of concerns about non-compliance and request specific actions to be taken to resolve the issue within a specific timeframe. The LDOE may also provide relevant documentation to help the LEA resolve the issue.
- As circumstances warrant, the LDOE and LEA may have face-to-face meetings to resolve the issue and monitor progress.
- Should the LEA fail to resolve non-compliance issues as expected or in a timely manner, the LDOE will formally notify the LEA in writing that grant funds may be rescinded unless the matter is resolved.
- Failure of the LEA to resolve a non-compliance issue may result in having grant funds rescinded and returned to the State for re-distribution to other sub-recipients.

### **A. Desktop Monitoring Plan**

The Project Director and staff of Grants Management, under District Support Office, will provide ongoing monitoring of programmatic and fiscal components of the LEAs' plans. The staff will make site visits when compliance issues arise. The Project Director will ensure fidelity of the sub-recipients' SOW and fiscal guarantees by:

- overseeing implementation timelines and budget expenditures for each of the six projects
- working directly with managers to ensure the implementation of these projects
- meeting in Cabinet Meetings with the Superintendent and other project managers twice a month to obtain ongoing updates across all initiatives of the LDOE
- corresponding monthly with Project Managers regarding the status of activities for each project in the SEA's Scope of Work

As part of the monitoring process, LDOE will conduct comprehensive annual reviews of each LEA's grant implementation. These reviews will include such components as: Scopes of Work, budgets, leading and lagging indicators, performance measures, reports, documentation and other related information. Grants Management staff will conduct these annual reviews in July, following the fourth quarterly reporting period (see IV. Components of Performance Monitoring Schedules). Grants Management staff will provide feedback to the LEAs in July and August so that adjustments can be made for the next implementation year.

### **B. Onsite Monitoring Plan**

When the desktop monitoring reveals any compliance issues or questions, the Office of Grants Management staff will conduct onsite visits, reviewing both the financial and programmatic elements. The team will evaluate all phases of program administration and operations of the sub-recipient in its implementation quality. The team may evaluate criteria such as:

- consistent noncompliance relative to unresolved findings during the desktop monitoring
- individual complaints to the agency
- total amount of the grant award
- failure to spend funds in accordance with annual budget or general failure to liquidate funds
- late reporting

- failure to adhere to terms and conditions set forth in the LEA's approved SOW and budget
- failure to make substantial progress toward grant goals and objectives.

### **III. Monitoring Protocols**

Each participating LEA, as part of their application process, developed a Scope of Work (SOW) and 3-year budget, working with their District Support Team staff and submitting through the electronic grants management system. The SOW and budget analysis will serve as the basis for the LEA monitoring plan. The State will monitor the performance indicators selected as foci for each district, measuring 19 areas that follow the predetermined Sub-criterion Performance Measures as listed in **Appendix A**. These performance indicators link to the RTTT Plan criteria through:

- A. Building Strong Statewide Capacity for Reform
- B. Standards and Assessments
- C. Using Data to Support Instruction
- D. Great Teachers and Leaders
- E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

#### **Programmatic Protocols**

Each quarter, LDOE will conduct check-ins with all LEAs and provide in-depth analysis of the adaptive challenges that LEAs identified in their Scopes of Work. In addition, LDOE will provide updates of budget expenditures, analyze any gaps in student-performance data, and examine the LEA's readiness to support the six projects outlined in the LA RTTT Plan. Updates on the status of support provided will help to pinpoint any problems in the implementation of RTTT. It will also enhance the LEAs' capacity for implementation. This information will be used to inform revisions to the SOW for Years 2 and 3. It will also facilitate the sharing of best practices and existing structures among LEAs, and will assist LDOE in targeting additional support needed by LEAs based on their needs and overseen by the District Support Office Network Teams.

LEAs will complete quarterly reports detailing the activities completed toward each RTTT goal. LEAs will be asked to rate themselves using Indistar®, and provide narratives on activities conducted toward reaching their goals. Artifacts will document the information provided. Quarterly check-ins with District Support Network Leaders, LDOE District Support Network Teams, the RTTT Project Director, and the Grants Management staff will provide updates on the budget analysis and reports to determine the level of implementation of each LEA's goals and activities with feedback given to LEAs and District Support Office Network Team staff.

#### **Budget Protocols**

Louisiana allocated 50% of the RTTT funds received to award sub-grants to participating LEAs for the implementation of a scope of work aligned to the SEA scope of work. The LDOE used



the LEAs federal Title I allocations to establish a ratio to determine the RTTT allocation each participating LEA would receive. Each LEAs Title I allocation was compared to the total Title I allocations to all participating districts to establish a percentage. That percentage was then applied to the total amount of RTTT funds available to determine each participating LEAs RTTT allocation. Allocations are granted in total for a period of three years, with continuation of access to funds based on an annual evaluation of implementation conducted in July.

All RTTT funds must be spent with an unprecedented level of transparency and accountability. Accordingly, recipients must maintain accurate, complete, and reliable documentation which is reported and checked quarterly via the grants management system (eGMS). Activities completed toward each of the RTTT goals must be reported and documented and will be reviewed by LDOE staff to determine the level of implementation of goals and activities each quarter. Feedback to the LEA and the LDOE District Support Team Leader will ensure the LEA gets the support needed to move forward. Funds will be paid to LEAs in a reimbursement process to ensure that funds are spent as planned in the LEA's SOW activities.

#### **IV. Components of Performance Monitoring Schedules: Program and Fiscal**

The RTTT performance monitoring plan creates a thorough monitoring plan that engages both the SEA and the LEA personnel in collaborative and professional learning cycles. This plan provides emphasis on analysis of data and effective practices and activities, ensuring effective use of fiscal resources as well as communicating the progress across all parties in meaningful and accessible ways.

The District Support Network Teams will focus on goal setting and activities for each participating LEA. Funding requests will be approved in August 2012 in time for LEAs to begin their work. Monitoring of each LEA's SOW implementation for the SY 2012-13 will occur in the following quarters:

- Quarter 1: August-October
- Quarter 2: November-January
- Quarter 3: February-April
- Quarter 4: May-June

Budget and programmatic reports from each LEA will be due and uploaded by the 15<sup>th</sup> of the following month after each quarter ends. Budget reports will be reported through eGMS and programmatic reports will be reported through Indistar®. This monitoring schedule will be repeated annually through December of 2015.

- **Programmatic Monitoring of LEAs**

The SEA will support and coordinate all grant oversight through desktop monitoring and follow-up with site-visits each quarter, when needed. The RTTT Project Director will have quarterly meetings with District Support Network Leaders. The implementation of RTTT activities may look different in every district and school but will align to SEA goals and performance measures.



Louisiana's RTTT Performance Indicators for sub-recipients (LEAs) will measure implementation of the LEA's SOW across five areas. The list of the 19 Louisiana RTTT Measurable Indicators may be found in **Appendix B**. The five broad areas are:

- A. Building Strong Statewide Capacity for Reform
- B. Standards and Assessments
- C. Using Data to Support Instruction
- D. Great Teachers and Leaders
- E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

The District Network Support Team will provide ongoing planning, goal setting, and implementation through a model that will effectively:

- Support districts in implementing RTTT SEA and LEA scope of work activities
- Communicate with districts by providing a single channel to and from districts thereby strengthening the sense of community between district and state leaders
- Empower districts to establish a set of practices to meet their local needs and context utilizing the support provided

The District Network Support Teams include:

- **1 Network Leader**
  - Sets vision and priorities for supporting 10-15 districts
  - Serves as both a primary point of contact for district leaders and a senior LDOE official
  - Participates in cross-network collaboration, keeping teams informed of key updates and adjusts practices accordingly
- **1 Deputy Network Leader**
  - Provides cross-functional support to the Network Leader
  - Manages the day-to-day operations of the network team
  - May eventually become Network Leader's successor
- **4-6 Support Coaches** with varied grade and subject expertise, including a mix of elementary, middle and high schools; literacy and math; special education
  - Observes everyday practice in schools
  - Uses observation and feedback cycle to build the capacity of district leaders (e.g. curriculum specialists, HR directors, talent officers, etc.)
- **1 Workflow Management Specialist**
  - Addresses districts' questions and concerns outside the scope of Common Core and Compass by referring districts to relevant LDOE resources
  - Ensures that networks maintain a consistent focus on the implementation of Common Core & Compass (i.e., takes action to prevent excessive distraction from other initiatives)
- **1 Data Specialist**

- Serves as liaison to the central LDOE analytics group and produces data reports for network team use
- Provides support to districts on the use of data tools and systems related to Common Core and Compass (e.g., HCIS, CVR, etc.)

### **Communicating the Performance Monitoring Plan to LEAs**

The Grants Management Office will offer both face-to-face presentations and webinars to fully include the LEAs in the monitoring plans and online reporting. Training sessions will be held to ensure all LEA monitoring liaisons know and understand the eGMS and Indistar® systems. The Grants Management Office will prepare deliverables as evidence that the SEA is working toward its goals in each core element area with LEAs and will produce an annual performance report in accordance with the USED performance review protocol.

#### **• Fiscal Monitoring of LEAs**

All RTTT funds must be spent with a high level of transparency and accountability, both for the SEA and the LEAs. The SEA will track all RTTT funds through the electronic Grants Management system (eGMS), maintaining accurate, complete, and reliable documentation of all expenditures. The Grants Management Office will continually review the SEA's management of the RTTT funds and that of the LEAs, ensuring both are using their portions in a reasonable, fair, and prompt manner and in conjunction with the SOW, goals, and activities.

The SEA will manage all SOW costs through the internal online monitoring and budgeting processes. The SEA will produce fiscal and programmatic reports which will be shared with the District Support Network Leaders who, along with their Teams, are providing support to the LEAs for implementation of their SOWs.

### **Resolutions**

The sub-recipient will receive a monitoring report when compliance issues have been noted. The sub-recipient will be expected to provide a Corrective Action Plan to address concerns. The Project Director will consider all findings, reports, and compliance issues resolved after the sub-recipient has provided sufficient evidence that the corrective action plan has been fully implemented. A letter will be issued to the sub-recipient to indicate that all finds have been resolved and to document which conditions/restrictions have been lifted.

## **V. Vendor and Contractor Monitoring Protocols**

All vendors and contractors enter into contractual agreements as defined by the Louisiana Department of Education protocol through the Office of Management and Finance, Purchasing and Contracts; executed by the Contractor and the Superintendent; and approved by BESE (Board of Elementary and Secondary Education), the Department of Civil Service and the Division of Administration, Office of Contractual Review, as applicable. No

contract amendment shall be valid unless it has been submitted through Purchasing and Contracts, executed by the Contractor and the Superintendent, and approved by BESE, the Department of Civil Service and the Office of Contractual Review, as applicable.

As required by the State's Office of Management and Finance, Purchasing and Contracts, each contract must include, among other categories:

**I. Scope of Services**

- *Specific goals and objectives:*
- *Deliverables:*
- *Performance Measures: (that are quantifiable and time-bound)*
- *Monitoring Plan: (for adherence to contract requirements and completion of work)*

**II. Payment Terms**

**III. Termination for Cause**

**IV. Termination for Convenience**

**V. Term of Contract**

**VI. Fiscal Funding**

**VII. Discrimination Clause**

**VIII. Compliance Statement**

**IX. Confidentiality**

Upon the conclusion of each contract, each vendor/contractor receives an evaluation of deliverable services. Payment is delivered only for projects that meet the deliverable services provided in the contract.

SECTION II: PART I APPLICATION COVER SHEET, ASSURANCES, AND SUBMISSION PROCEDURES

(A)(2) Sub-criterion Performance Measures

| Performance Measures<br><i>Applicants must develop and propose for the Department's approval performance measure(s) for any sub-criterion that did not include performance measures in the Phase 2 application. Please enter the proposed performance measure in the row in this table and provide annual targets in the columns provided.</i> | Actual Data:<br>Baseline SY<br>2010 - 2011 | End of SY 2011-<br>2012 | End of SY 2012-<br>2013 | End of SY<br>2013-2014 | End of SY 2014-<br>2015 |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Percentage of participating LEAs with 5% increases in district performance scores from year to year.   | 33%  | 50%                     | 75%                     | 90%                    | 100%                    |

## (B)(3) Sub-Criterion Performance Measures

| <b>Performance Measures</b><br><i>Applicants must develop and propose for the Department's approval performance measure(s) for any sub-criterion that did not include performance measures in the Phase 2 application. Please enter the proposed performance measure in the row in this table and provide annual targets in the columns provided.</i> | Actual Data: Baseline SY 2010 - 2011 | End of SY 2011-2012 | End of SY 2012-2013 | End of SY 2013-2014 | End of SY 2014-2015 |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Students perform at or above grade level on Math LEAP by 8 <sup>th</sup> grade (Statewide).   | 60%                                  | 62.5%               | 65%                 | 67%                 | 70%                 |
| Percentage of schools offering one or more AP courses (Statewide)   | 43%                                  |                     | 45%                 | 47%                 | 50%                 |
| Increase the number of students enrolled in AP courses (Statewide)  | 7,984                                |                     | 10,000              | 11,000              | 12,000              |
| Increase the number of students taking AP exams (Statewide)   | 7,668                                |                     | 9,500               | 10,500              | 11,500              |
| Increase the number of students scoring 3 or better on AP exams (Statewide)   | 3,297                                |                     | 3,800               | 4,200               | 4,600               |
| Increase the number of students enrolled in STEM focused AP courses (Statewide)   | 2,755                                |                     | 3,500               | 4,000               | 4,500               |
| Increase the number of students meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmark Scores (Overall)  | 16%                                  | 17%                 | 20%                 | 30%                 | 40%                 |
| Increase the number of students meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmark Scores in Mathematics   | 33%                                  | 35%                 | 40%                 | 45%                 | 50%                 |
| Increase the number of students meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmark Scores in English   | 67%                                  | 70%                 | 73%                 | 76%                 | 80%                 |
| Increase the number of students meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmark Scores in Reading   | 45%                                  | 46%                 | 50%                 | 60%                 | 70%                 |
| Increase in the number of students meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmark Scores in Science  | 21%                                  | 23%                 | 25%                 | 30%                 | 40%                 |

## (C)(3) Sub-Criterion Performance Measures

| <b>Performance Measures</b><br><br><i>Applicants must develop and propose for the Department's approval performance measure(s) for any sub-criterion that did not include performance measures in the Phase 2 application. Please enter the proposed performance measure in the row in this table and provide annual targets in the columns provided.</i> | <b>Actual Data:<br/>Baseline SY<br/>2010 - 2011</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2011-2012</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2012-2013</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2013-2014</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2014-2015</b> |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Total number of test forms for benchmark assessment created by teachers (Statewide).  | 100,000   | 105,000                        | 110,250                        | 115,756                        | 121,544                        |
| Number of Log-ins to EAGLE (Statewide)  | 1.5M  | 1.9M                           | 2.2M                           | 2.5M                           | 2.8M                           |
| Number of Completed Tests by Students (Statewide)   | 1M  | 1.3M                           | 1.6M                           | 1.9M                           | 2.2M                           |

## (D)(2) Sub-Criterion Performance Measures

| Performance Measures  |  | Actual Data:<br>Baseline SY<br>2010 - 2011 | End of SY<br>2011-2012 | End of SY<br>2012-2013 | End of SY<br>2013-2014 | End of SY<br>2014-2015 |
|---|--|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section VI. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D) (2)(ii).</i> |  |  |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| Criteria  | General goals to be provided at time of application:   | Baseline data and annual targets           |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| (D)(2)(i)   | Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth                                 | 0  | 40%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(ii)  | Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.            | 0  | 40%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(ii)  | Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.          | 0  | 40%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(iv)  | Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform: |  |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| (D)(2)(iv)(a)   | • Developing teachers and principals.  | 0  | 40%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(iv)(b)   | • Compensating teachers and principals.  | 0  | 25%                    | 50%                    | 75%                    | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(iv)(b)   | • Promoting teachers and principals.   | 0  | 25%                    | 50%                    | 75%                    | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(iv)(b)   | • Retaining effective teachers and principals.   | 0  | 40%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(iv)(c)   | • Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.   | 0  | 15%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| (D)(2)(iv)(d)   | • Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.                        | 0  | 15%                    | 100%                   | 100%                   | 100%                   |
| General data to be provided at time of application:   |  |  |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| Total number of participating LEAs.   |  | 93   |                        |                        |                        |                        |



| Total number of principals in participating LEAs.                 |   | 702    |
|---|---|--------|
| Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.                   |   | 20,982 |
| [Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data] |   |        |
| Criterion   | Data to be requested of grantees in the future:   |        |
| (D)(2)(ii)  | Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.   |        |
| (D)(2)(iii) <sup>2</sup>  | Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.                    |        |
| (D)(2)(iii)   | Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.                            |        |
| (D)(2)(iv)(b)   | Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year. |        |
| (D)(2)(iv)(b)   | Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.  |        |
| (D)(2)(iv)(c)   | Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.  |        |
| (D)(2)(iv)(c)   | Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.                      |        |
| (D)(2)(iv)(d)   | Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.  |        |

## (D)(3) Sub-Criterion Performance Measures

| Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)   | Actual Data:<br>Baseline SY<br>2010 - 2011 | End of SY 2011-<br>2012 | End of SY 2012-<br>2013 | End of SY 2013-<br>2014 | End of SY 2014-<br>2015 |
|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>  |  |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| <b>General goals to be provided at time of application:</b>  | <b>Baseline data and annual targets</b>    |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are highly effective.        | n/a  | 10                      | 15                      | 20                      | 25                      |
| Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are highly effective.          | n/a  | 10                      | 15                      | 20                      | 25                      |
| Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are ineffective.             | n/a  | 10                      | 8                       | 5                       | 3                       |
| Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are ineffective.               | n/a  | 10                      | 8                       | 5                       | 3                       |
| Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are highly effective. | n/a  | 10                      | 15                      | 20                      | 25                      |
| Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are highly effective.   | n/a  | 10                      | 15                      | 20                      | 25                      |
| Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are ineffective.      | n/a  | 10                      | 8                       | 5                       | 3                       |
| Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are ineffective.        | n/a  | 10                      | 8                       | 5                       | 3                       |
| High-poverty schools were defined as those with 65% of students or more qualifying for free/reduced lunch.       |  |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| High-minority schools were defined as those with 50% or more minority students.                                  |  |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| <b>General data to be provided at time of application:</b>   |  |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both.   | 733  |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both.   | 531  |                         |                         |                         |                         |

|   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both.  | 7,652 |  |
| Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both.  | 6,746 |  |
| Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both.   | 733   |  |
| Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both.   | 531   |  |
| [Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]   |       |  |
| <b>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</b>  |       |  |
| Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year. |       |  |
| Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year.   |       |  |
| Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.      |       |  |
| Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.        |       |  |

## (E)(2) Sub-Criterion Performance Measures

| <b>Performance Measures</b><br><i>Applicants must develop and propose for the Department's approval performance measure(s) for any sub-criterion that did not include performance measures in the Phase 2 application. Please enter the proposed performance measure in the row in this table and provide annual targets in the columns provided.</i> | <b>Actual Data:<br/>Baseline SY<br/>2010 - 2011)</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2011-2012</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2012-2013</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2013-2014</b> | <b>End of SY<br/>2014-2015</b> |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Total number of charter schools Statewide.  | 90   | 98                             | 107                            | 117                            | 127                            |
| Percentage of low-performing schools in participating LEAs with 5% increases in SPS scores.   | 35%  | 55%                            | 75%                            | 90%                            | 100%                           |
| The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models will be initiated each year.   | 32   | 39                             | 30                             | 30                             | 30                             |